

REMARKS

The claims remaining in the application are 1-7.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The trademark/trade name Firewire has been deleted from claim 4.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action has rejected claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schiefer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,922). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

U.S. Patent No. 6,177,922 teaches methods for producing video signal timing for a display device that has a format mismatch with an input video format. The programming interface in the '922 patent is a bus that is internal to the apparatus. The video input interface and video decoder blocks receive legacy video signals that must be analyzed to determine the format.

The present application has a programming interface that communicates the input and display parameters. Thus, a separate communications interface is used to transmit from the device providing the video source the video parameters. U.S. Patent No. 6,177,922 suffers from the problem addressed by the present application in that the video signal must be analyzed to determine the parameters (already known by the source of the video). This format detection creates a visual disruption.

The Office Action has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagai (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,801). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

U.S. Patent No. 6,476,801 teaches a method for analyzing video inputs to determine if they conform to either a video legacy format (NTSC) or a computer format (VGA) and optimizing the display driving circuits based on which it is. There is no teaching that describes a direct transmission from the source of the video to the display that can explicitly describe the format and

thereby avoid the analysis as in the present invention. The apparatus in the '801 patent must analyze the signal and determine its parameters.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schiefer (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,922) in view of Ide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,753,831). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagai (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,801) in view of Ide (U.S. Patent No. 6,753,831). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

U.S. Patent No. 6,753,831 teaches an apparatus that provides for multiple video inputs that can be selected via an external signal, and a method to store the video parameters that have been created by a traditional analysis of the signals. This allows the system to rapidly switch between inputs that have been previously analyzed, however, it does not address what happens if a single input format changes. Again, there is no explicit communication to the source of the video as in the present application. Thus, the '831 patent either by itself or in combination with U.S. Patent Nos. 6,177,922 or 6,476,801 render the present invention obvious.

CONCLUSION

Dependent claims not specifically addressed add additional limitations to the independent claims, which have been distinguished from the prior art and are therefore also patentable.

In conclusion, none of the prior art cited by the Office Action discloses the limitations of the claims of the present invention, either individually or in combination. Therefore, it is believed that the claims are allowable.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that additional modifications to the claims are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, he is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the number listed below for a telephone interview and Examiner's amendment.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 29,134

Nelson A. Blish/tms
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2720
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.